



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,690	12/06/2004	Yasufumi Shimoe	Q84877	4505
23373	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			NATALINI, JEFF WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2858	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

★

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,690	SHIMOE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff Natalini	2858	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 03 February 2006 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a) ☐ entered.
- b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

- d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.
- e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

In deleting "the case where said determination region setting means determines as being" (in claims 1, 13, 16, 18, and 19), applicant has changed the scope of the invention because this claim no longer has the limitation: the determination region setting means determine being in a comparative determination effective region. Although the examiner does not necessarily believe that applicants amendment (filed 2/3/06) would make the claims non-allowable, however the applicants amendment has broadened the scope of the claimed invention, therefore raising new issues which requires further consideration and/or search by the examiner.

All other changes are strictly for formal matters and would be acceptable. Though the change in claim 1 on line 13 creates grammar problems "value as comparative determination", probably should read "value as a comparative determination". Also in claim 14 on line 6-7 the amended claim reads "voltage waveform at time when no harmonics" should read "voltage waveform at a time when no harmonics".



DIANE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER